REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are currently pending. The Examiner has again rejected Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-11, 13-17, 25, and 28 as unpatentable over USP 5,479,601 to Malamud in view of Cain; Claims 4, 7, 12, and 18-24 unpatentable over USP 5,479,601 to Malamud in view of Cain and Andrew; Claims 26 and 27 as unpatentable over USP 5,694,561 to Malamud in view of Cain and Selby. Based on the currently submitted amendments and the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited art.

The primary reference for all rejections is the Malamud patent. The Malamud patent is directed to a method whereby a user of a windowing system can select multiple pre-existing windows and assign the multiple windows to a logical "project group" (shown in project group window 201 of Fig. 2). The project group is created by using existing, predefined commands of the underlying window system (see: Col. 6, lines 35-48) such as cloning an existing project group folder, copying an existing template, altering the settings of an existing project group folder, or using a predefined "CreateProject" routine. By doing so, the user creates a group window having group window frame controls which are controls that can be exercised on all of the windows within the whole group at the same time, such as minimize, maximize, color coding as illustrated by the

WH997-001   12

cross-hatched top bar on windows 203, 207 and 208 in Fig. 2, or collective "open" and "close" operations. The Malamud patent provides for manipulation or control of the window containing multiple windows but does not provide for exercising controls within the window frame on or in any of the windows. Malamud does not teach or suggest the system and method for developing a window and for defining window application controls or behaviors for operations within the window which is being developed. The present invention, as taught and as now claimed in the amended claims, provides for creation and manipulation of window application controls for responding to events which occur within the window (i.e., in the application display area), not window frame controls. Applicants respectfully assert that the Malamud patent does not, alone or in combination with Cain or Selby, obviate the invention as claimed.

The Examiner cites reference numerals 203, 205, 207 and 208 against the cited "plurality of control enhancers". However, the Malamud reference numerals 203, 205, 207 and 208 refer to windows and not to control enhancers or control enhancer objects as interfaces to application controls for windows, as is expressly claimed by the present invention. Further, the Examiner cites the list of grouped windows in a project group (from Col. 10, lines 16-21) as a list of control enhancers, whereas the present invention teaches and claims a list of control enhancer objects within a window object. Clearly the listed windows do not

WH997-001   13

comprise a list of control enhancers for a plurality of application controls within a window object.

Applicants again note that the Examiner cites the teachings from Col. 10, lines 9-24, and specifically lines 16-21, not only for the list of control enhancers but also for the specific behaviors and for the control enhancer objects determining which control enhancer object should handle a received event. Applicants respectfully reiterate that the cited teachings from Malamud's Col. 10 provide no such teaching or suggestion. Malamud simply details a list or alternative display of grouped windows from a user-defined project group of windows. Malamud does not teach or suggest any window application controls, control enhancer objects, or lists or use thereof.

With respect to the specific behaviors, the Examiner additionally cites Col. 9, lines 54-58 wherein Malamud discusses a "behavior of the project group" such as the cross-hatched display. Clearly a group window frame "behavior" is not the same as or suggestive of specific application behaviors for one specific application control within an application display area of one window object as is claimed by the present invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Malamud patent teachings of a user grouping pre-existing windows for group window frame manipulation is not the same as nor suggestive of the present invention which provides a system and method for customizing window objects with specific window application

WH997-001   14

controls and behaviors using control enhancer objects and for providing the list of control enhancer objects from which an event handling control enhancer object can be selected.

The Examiner acknowledges that the Malamud patent is silent with respect to a plurality of window controls and cites the Cain patent. The Cain patent is directed to a graphical tool which can be used to create a GUI with methods attached to the GUI objects. The Cain "methods" are not the same as nor suggestive of control enhancer objects, which each provide an interface to a specific window application control for a window object customized with specific behaviors, as is taught and claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of teachings from the references would not obviate the presently claimed invention. The combination would result in a Malamud system with grouped windows having window frame controls for manipulating the group as a whole, wherein the graphical display of the window-framed group could be created with the Cain tool. There are simply no teachings in either Malamud or Cain which relate to the creating and use of control enhancer objects for specific application controls within a window. Clearly, the combination would not obviate the invention as claimed.

Applicants further note that the Selby patent does not provide the teachings which are missing from Malamud and Cain. The Selby patent provides a structured approach by pre-defining controls and their attributes in a table (500). When a control

WH997-001   15

is needed, Selby pulls up the table and selects the control. Selby does not provide control enhancer objects as interfaces to windows, nor does Selby provide for customization of control enhancer objects with classes and subclasses to provide specific behaviors to be defined for each window control. The present inventive creation and use of control enhancers allows developers the flexibility to provide interfaces (i.e., the control enhancer objects) which do not require specific coding for interfacing with the windows; and, then allows customization of the objects for the required specific behaviors at a base class and subclass level. Clearly the Selby patent disclosure of table-driven control selection does not teach or suggest the creation and use of control enhancer objects as taught and claimed by the present invention.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections based on cited references, withdrawal of the rejections, and issuance of the claims as amended.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 2 9 2003

OFFICIAL

Respectfully submitted,
M. E. Siksa, et al

By: _Anne Vachon Dougherty_
    Anne Vachon Dougherty
    Attorney for Applicant
    Reg. No. 30,374

WH997-001   16